DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 259 596 HE 017 989

TITLE	A Guide for Self-Study and Evaluation, 1984-85.
INSTITUTION	North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Chicago, IL. Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	1 Sep 84
NOTE	73p.; For related documents, see HE 017 990-991.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accreditation (Institutions); Ancillary School Services; College Administration; College Admission; College Faculty; College Planning; College Programs; College Role; *Evaluation Criteria; Governance; Guidelines; *Higher Education; *Institutional Evaluation; Reports; School Funds; School Organization; *Self Evaluation (Groups); Student Evaluation; Student Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS	Commission on Institutions of Higher Education; *North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

ABSTRACT

A guide to assist colleges undertaking self-studies to meet accreditation requirements is presented by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. The guide may also be used by the Commission's consultant-evaluators. After outlining the purposes and principles underlying institutional self-study for accreditation, organizational steps are covered, including: initiating the self-study process, establishing the steering committee and self-study committees, and developing a self-study plan. Areas of concern include: statements of mission and purpose; human, financial, and physical resources; institutional governance; academic programs and alternative study modes; evaluating outcomes of the college's operations; and planning. Writing the report and parts of the report are discussed, and summaries of sample self-study materials available from the Commission are provided. The summaries identify the purpose of the evaluation for which the materials were prepared and the nature of the institution. Also considered are focused evaluations that do not require a comprehensive self-study report. The evaluative criteria of the Commission are identified, along with questions on which information needs to be collected. Resource publications are also briefly described. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED259596

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NCA

A GUIDE FOR SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION

HE 017 451

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Commission on Instit. of ~~Higher Education,~~ North Central Assoc. of Colleges & Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

1984-85

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

2

The information contained in this document is accurate as of September 1, 1984. If substantive changes in policy or procedure occur before the next edition, institutions affiliated with the Commission and consultant-evaluators will be notified. ©1984 by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

159 North Dearborn Street

Chicago, Illinois 60601

1984

STAFF OF
THE COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
(312) 263-0456 (800) 621-7440

Thurston E. Manning	Director
Joseph J. Semrow	Associate Director
Patricia A. Thrash	Associate Director
Steven D. Crow	Assistant Director
Jean Mather	Assistant Director
Susan E. Van Kollenburg	Coordinator of Operations

CONTENTS

	PREFACE	
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Self-Study in Accreditation	1
	The Purposes of Self-Study	2
	Principles of Self-Study	3
II.	ORGANIZING FOR SELF-STUDY	5
	Initiating the Process	5
	The Role of the Steering Committee	5
	Preliminary Planning	6
	Developing a Self-Study Plan	7
	Organizing the Self-Study	9
III.	CONDUCTING THE SELF-STUDY	10
	The Self-Study and the Criteria	10
	Mission and Purposes	10
	Resources	11
	Human Resources	12
	Financial Resources	13
	Physical Resources	14
	Organization	14
	Programs	14
	Accomplishment of Purposes	15
	Continuity and Planning	16
IV.	REPORTING THE SELF-STUDY	18
	The Purposes of the Report	18
	The Three Essential Elements	18
	The First Essential Element	18
	The Second Essential Element	20
	The Third Essential Element	20
	Organization of the Report	21
	Writing the Report	23
V.	AIDS FOR SELF-STUDY	25
	Two Approaches to the Self-Study	25
	Sample Self-Study Materials	39
VI.	FOCUSED EVALUATIONS	57
	Focused Reports	57
	RESOURCES FOR SELF-STUDY	60
	MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION	66

PREFACE

Over the past several years members of the staff of the Commission have been engaged in research which they have used to develop materials to assist institutions undertaking self-studies for accreditation. Part of this research has focused on identifying the specifics which visiting teams examine to determine whether an institution satisfies the Commission's Criteria, and on formulating questions designed to gather and organize data about these specifics during self-study. Another part has involved identifying, annotating and disseminating sample self-study materials from a broad spectrum of institutions.

This *Guide for Self-Study and Evaluation* grows out of and builds on the foundation of both this Commission's research and that of others. It is meant to be a spur to reflection rather than a gospel, a resource rather than a set of commandments. Since the Commission specifies no single approach to self-study, the various approaches presented in the pages that follow should be seen as suggestions rather than prescriptions. On the other hand, because an institution's self-study report is crucial to the accreditation process, the Commission **does** require that the process be grounded on certain principles and that the report contain certain essential elements which are identified in this *Guide*.

The staff of the Commission has prepared the *Guide* to assist institutions as they organize, conduct and report the results of their self-study. Together with the *Handbook of Accreditation* and the *Manual for the Evaluation Visit*, it provides institutions and team members with a detailed description of the principles, policies, and procedures which currently govern the Commission's accreditation process. Like these other publications, it is revised and republished annually. The *Handbook* is the core of this set of documents, and both the *Manual* and this *Guide* assume their reader's familiarity with it. The *Guide* is specifically addressed to institutions being evaluated, but it is also intended for use by consultant-evaluators.

The Introduction outlines the purposes and principles underlying institutional self-study for accreditation. Chapter II offers advice and suggestions for establishing a self-study plan and organizing the self-study process. Chapter III discusses implementing that plan and conducting the self-study; it also provides further information on the areas that need to be examined to demonstrate that the institution fulfills the Commission's Criteria. Chapter IV treats the self-study report and its essential elements. Chapter V provides aids to self-study. Most of this *Guide* is directed to preparing for a comprehensive evaluation. Chapter VI, however, is addressed to institutions preparing for the other type of evaluation the Commission conducts—**the focused evaluation**. The *Guide* concludes with a brief list of other resources for planning and conducting a self-study.

The staff of the Commission hopes that this *Guide*, together with the *Handbook* and *Manual*, will answer most of the questions about the self-study for accreditation that institutions and visiting team members will have. Please contact us if they do not.

I. Introduction

The Self-Study in Accreditation

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education conducts its evaluations for candidacy and accreditation both to provide public certification of the quality of the institutions affiliated with it and to encourage their improvement. These purposes could be (and have been) achieved through a variety of evaluative methodologies. Since the fifties, the Commission has chosen to emphasize institutional self-study in its evaluative approach because this emphasis has proven to be both particularly well-suited to the principles to which the Commission is dedicated and particularly useful to institutions themselves. Insisting as it has since the thirties that accreditation decisions should be based on evaluation of an institution in terms of its effectiveness in achieving its own appropriate mission and purposes, the Commission has found it logical to rely on the institution's conducting a self-evaluation as the first step in the accreditation process. Recognizing that careful self-analysis is crucial to any institution's effectiveness, the Commission has continued to require periodic self-study as a part of the accreditation process in an effort to foster institutional improvement.

Evaluation requires that the quality of an object be judged in relation to some yardstick. In the Commission's evaluations for candidacy and accreditation the object is the postsecondary institution; the bases upon which the institution's quality and effectiveness are judged are the Criteria for Candidacy or the Criteria for Accreditation (including the General Institutional Requirements and the Evaluative Criteria). And the process of evaluation involves an institution and its parts asking themselves a set of questions framed by the *Evaluative Criteria* established by the Commission. In an evaluation for accreditation, those questions are:

- What are our purposes?
- Have we organized adequate resources (human, financial, and physical) into educational and other programs to accomplish our purposes?

- Are we accomplishing our purposes?
- Can we continue to accomplish our purposes?

In an evaluation for candidacy, they are:

- What are our purposes?
- Have we organized adequate resources (human, financial and physical) into programs that are accomplishing our **immediate** purposes?
- Have we developed realistic plans and a reasonable timetable to acquire and organize the additional resources needed to accomplish **all** of our purposes?
- Can we meet the Criteria for Accreditation by the end of our candidacy period?

The institution's self-evaluation in the context of these questions is summarized in its self-study report, and that report then serves as a basis for an external evaluation by a team of consultant-evaluators representing the Commission.

The Purposes of Self-Study

The self-study process and report required by the Commission are sometimes seen as obstacles to be overcome, hoops to be jumped through, in order to achieve candidacy or accreditation. Too often, they are viewed as extraneous to the ordinary life of the institution, as something to be undertaken *de novo* every five or ten years. Yet the questions raised by the Criteria should make it apparent that the kind of self-evaluation the Commission requires should be an ongoing part of every institution's daily life. And, ideally, the self-study for accreditation should flow naturally out of that ongoing process of institutional self-analysis. The Commission requires that an institution formally examine itself, assess its strengths and concerns, and plan how to capitalize on those strengths and eliminate or alleviate those concerns. In a period when the pressures on most educational institutions are more severe than they have been in recent memory, nothing will seem to be *less* extraneous or more valuable to an institution's present and future.

The Commission has made conducting a periodic program of self-study a primary obligation of each of the institutions seeking or continuing affiliation with it, both to establish a basis for its evaluations and to foster the attitudes and structures of self-analysis that every institution needs to survive and progress.

It is important to emphasize that both the self-study and the self-study report can serve purposes beyond those directly related to the accreditation process. Herbert Kells provides a convenient summary of these other institution-related benefits and purposes in his *Self-Study Processes* (1983). Effective self-study, he observes, may achieve purposes such as:

- incorporating ongoing, useful institutional research and self-analysis into the life of the institution
- providing a firm foundation for planning efforts
- orienting recently hired staff, especially new chief executive officers, to the institution
- narrowing the gap that often exists between personal and organizational goals
- improving institutional openness and communication
- identifying new leaders within the institution
- stimulating long-neglected review of policies, practices, procedures and records
- yielding useful fund-raising ideas and the basic documents upon which such efforts can be based

Principles of Self-Study

The Commmission believes that an effective self-study process must serve both internal and external purposes. Because it realizes that the structures and methods appropriate to the internal purposes of one institution differ from those appropriate to another, the Commission does not prescribe the precise nature and form of an institution's self-study. Instead, institutions are free to select the specific methodologies and techniques of evaluation that best suit their own needs. Different settings will invite different approaches, and individual approaches will often be dependent on the backgrounds and preferences of the particular individuals involved in the process.

While the Commission does not prescribe the details of an individual institution's self-study process, it does require that every self-study process for candidacy or accreditation be guided by several general principles.

The self-study for initial or continued candidacy or accreditation must be genuinely *institutional*—in perspective and in participation. The Commission does not evaluate departments or programs, although evaluating an institution in terms of the Commission's Criteria will

require that all of the institution's component parts be examined. Ultimately, the information gathered through evaluation of each part must be used to formulate an evaluation of the institution as a whole. An *institutional* self-study should involve all parts of the institution. That is, the Commission does not ask for an *administrative* self-study or a *faculty* self-study. And for a self-study to be genuinely institutional broad participation by all segments of the institutional community is necessary. Committee appointments, the decision-making involved in establishing and implementing the self-study plan, the final consolidation of the information gained into a self-study report—all of these aspects of the process should reflect such participation.

The self-study process and the report growing out of it must be *evaluative*. It is not enough for a self-study report simply to describe the programs, operation and environment of an institution. This is but a part of the institution's task. The institution must go further, must evaluate its programs, operation and environment in terms of the Commission's Criteria. Demonstrating that the institution satisfies the appropriate Criteria is the primary requisite of every self-study report.

II. Organizing For Self-Study

Initiating the Process

When planning for an evaluation begins, the institution's chief executive officer is asked to identify a self-study coordinator, to choose a date for the visit, to indicate the competencies desirable in the visiting team, and to submit a plan for the self-study to the Commission. At this point and throughout the self-study process, the chief executive officer's role in the self-study is crucial. If the chief executive officer makes it clear by both word and action that the self-study is an institutional priority, the value and success of the process are greatly enhanced. To indicate the importance of the self-study to the institution, the chief executive officer should appoint the self-study coordinator and the steering committee, should formally charge them with their task, and should provide them with the necessary support to carry out their charge, including support staff assistance and clerical assistance.

The Role of the Steering Committee

The choice of the self-study coodinator and the members of the steering committee is an extremely important factor in establishing the direction and tenor of the self-study. Those chosen should be knowledgeable and energetic, should have the respect of the institution's various constituencies, and should be **broadly representative** of those constituencies. A steering committee made up solely of the administrative cabinet, for example, is less likely to be effective in establishing an atmosphere of institution-wide participation than one that includes faculty members who have the respect of their peers. Each CEO will make these appointments according to his or her personal style of administrative decision-making, but Commission experience shows that the more broadly representative the steering committee is the more likely it is to receive the cooperation necessary to carry out its task. That task is to develop a self-study plan and coordinate its implementation.

Preliminary Planning

Before developing its formal self-study plan (which is sometimes called the "prospectus" or "design"), the steering committee should be fully informed of the Commission's expectations and requirements for the evaluation, should review the Team Report(s) of the institution's last comprehensive evaluation by the Commission and any subsequent focused evaluations, should examine the institution's current Statement of Affiliation Status, should survey the evaluation processes already in place, and should carefully study the Commission's Criteria.

The Commission's expectations depend upon the particular purposes of the evaluation. **Comprehensive evaluations** are conducted for initial or continued candidacy or accreditation; **focused evaluations** (see Chapter VI) are conducted to examine specific areas of the institution's operations. Both comprehensive and focused evaluations may include examination of institutional changes covered by the Commission's "Policy on Changes Affecting the Affiliated Status of an Institution." The reminder letter sent to the institution's chief executive officer provides information on the nature of the evaluation and the procedures to be followed. The Committee will need to study carefully the *Handbook of Accreditation*, the *Manual for the Evaluation Visit* and this *Guide* so that it has an overview of Commission policies and procedures and understands their application to its own evaluation.

In addition to understanding the purposes of the evaluation, the steering committee should review its most recent Commission Team Reports, the institution's formal responses to those reports, and the last accrediting action taken by the Commission. This review helps to establish a context for the current evaluation—a context which the steering committee will share with the evaluation team's members, since they also receive copies of these reports. The committee may begin by considering the strengths and concerns expressed in these reports. What progress has the institution made in responding to the concerns identified in them? Are the strengths still valid? What major new developments have occurred since the last evaluation? Since the self-study report will eventually need to address all of these areas, examining them at this stage should help to direct the committee's planning of the self-study process.

The committee should review the institution's current Statement of Affiliation Status. Is all of the information

contained in it still accurate? Are there changes that the institution wishes to make which will necessitate changes in the Statement? Any inaccuracies or requested changes in the Statement should be called to the attention of the Commission staff.

The committee should also review the planning and evaluation processes the institution already has in place. Most institutions engage in such processes for a variety of reasons, including the expectations and requirements of their governing boards and those of external agencies to which the institutions are related. Some institutions have evaluation processes in place as a part of their applications for or as a part of the conditions of external funding. Others engage in periodic evaluation for continued recognition by a myriad of specialized accrediting agencies. The steering committee should not set out to reinvent the wheel. Rather than duplicating work that has already been done, it should inventory and use the information gained through these other evaluation processes in its self-study for the Commission.

Finally, the committee should focus its attention on the Criteria for Candidacy or the Criteria for Accreditation (including the General Institutional Requirements and the Evaluative Criteria). Since these Criteria are the foundation of the Commission's evaluation process, the institution's self-study must be oriented toward them.

Developing A Self-Study Plan

> "Would you tell me please, which way I ought to go from here?," asked Alice.
> "That depends a good deal on where you want to get to," said the Cat.
> "I don't much care where—," said Alice.
> "Then it doesn't matter which way you go," said the Cat.

Since it clearly does matter where the self-study is going, the committee will need to map out its direction and communicate that direction to those who participate in the self-study process. Institutional self-study may take a variety of forms and use a number of approaches, but each of them will arrive at the same destination: a valid and reasonable evaluation of the institution's purposes, resources and organization, effectiveness and plans for the future.

The committee's first task is to design a self-study process that both fits the needs of the institution and satisfies the

requirements of the Commission. This self-study plan should then be submitted to the staff of the Commission for review. The plan should begin by setting forth the objectives the self-study is designed to achieve, and proceed to outline the process for achieving those objectives. A primary objective, of course, is gaining or continuing candidacy or accreditation with the Commission. And that objective is to be achieved through a plan that outlines a data collection and evaluation process focused on the Criteria. But the self-study will usually have other internal objectives as well, and the plan will be designed to accomplish them too. An institution may want to use the self-study as an opportunity to reconsider and revise its mission; or to study enrollment trends; or to assess the impact of a new governance system; or to begin work on a long-range plan; or to evaluate and revise such a plan. All of these and many other objectives can be compatible with the self-study for accreditation.

The steps the steering committee should take to develop its self-study plan are relatively straightforward. It should:

- identify the objectives of the self-study
- establish a timetable
- develop a preliminary outline of the self-study report
- determine the evaluation methodologies to be used
- identify ongoing evaluation processes and determine how best to integrate these into the self-study process for Commission evaluation
- specify the data to be gathered in each of the key areas of purposes, description, assessment of effectiveness, and plans for action
- specify the instruments and processes for collecting data
- formulate and implement an organizational and committee structure consistent with the objectives
- integrate and synthesize the information gathered
- write—or oversee the writing of—the self-study report

Organizing the Self-Study

The nature of the organization for self-study will vary according to the scope, nature and emphasis of the self-study plan. It will also vary according to the size, complexity and character of the institution. The organization appropriate to self-study at a large urban university will differ, for example, from that most appropriate to a small rural liberal arts college. No single pattern of organization is appropriate to all institutions.

Institutional committees should be created in accordance with the self-study plan. Committees involved in comprehensive institutional self-study should have members representing all of the institution's constituents. It is usually wise to include on committees, or at least to provide an opportunity for reactions from, someone who is not directly involved in the area under study (e.g., student services should not be studied by student services personnel alone). It is also useful to involve those whose interests might be affected by the area (e.g., a student on the student services committee).

A key to an effectively organized committee structure is providing for adequate communication among the various committees and between the committees and the institution at large—both at the beginning and throughout the self-study process.

III. Conducting The Self-Study

The Self-Study and the Criteria

A self-study for candidacy or accreditation may serve a variety of internal and external purposes, but—whatever else it may do—**it must demonstrate that the institution meets the Commission's General Institutional Requirements and fulfills the appropriate Evaluative Criteria.** Demonstrating that the institution meets the General Institutional Requirements requires examining its programs, organization and operation; demonstrating that it fulfills the Evaluative Criteria requires examining its purposes, resources, effectiveness, and planning processes as well. To evaluate the institution as a whole, its various parts also need to be examined.

Chapter V presents several ways of approaching the self-study, as well as descriptions of sample self-study materials available from the Commission on request. In using these or other approaches, those involved in the self-study process may wish to begin by considering the following general observations.

Mission and Purposes

A postsecondary institution's mission and purposes provide the rationale for both its establishment and the objectives of its current operations. They reveal the philosophical stance of the institution's designers toward education and provide a framework for maintaining the institution's integrity and planning its development.

Postsecondary educational institutions serve many purposes. Some limit their endeavors to a single task or to a small number of related tasks; others address themselves to a great number of largely unrelated tasks. In a system of postsecondary education characterized by diversity, it is crucial that each institution determine what it will commit its limited resources to.

The single-purpose institution or the institution with a small number of closely-related purposes is able to formulate a statement of its purposes as a whole. With a large, complex university this is clearly not possible

except at a very high level of generality. Instead, each major unit or division may be expected to have a statement of its own purposes within the total institution.

There are many types of institutional purposes. Some are intellectual, some are affective; some are professional and occupational, some are "liberal"; some involve the pursuit of knowledge through research, others involve public service; some relate to values and attitudes, and others relate to training and skills. In defining its mission and purposes, an institution must not only choose its particular purposes but must establish the priorities among them.

Statements of mission and purpose provide a guide for planning and operation as well as a framework for decision-making—about admissions and retention policies; about curricular and extracurricular programs; about the hiring, retention, tenure and promotion of faculty; about the institution's organizational structure; and about its financial and physical resource needs.

An institution's purposes will normally consider its role in its region and community, as well as in the nation. Its statement of purposes should be flexible enough to allow it to respond to new challenges and opportunities, but firm enough to allow it to resist pressures for haphazard or unplanned growth or retrenchment. Its statement should also establish the character and priorities by which the institution can cope with the many demands which it must face.

An institution has a responsibility to keep the public informed of its educational goals and its efforts to accomplish them. Consequently, all of its publications should accurately reflect its mission and purposes.

Resources

Obviously, an institution's available resources play a large part in determining the quality of the education it can provide. Without sufficient human, financial and physical resources an institution cannot possibly achieve its purposes. Evaluation of an institution's resources should always be placed in the context of those resources' relation to the institution's mission and purposes. This aspect of the institutional self-study, sometimes characterized as input analysis, should treat several general areas.

Human Resources. An institution's ability to accomplish its purposes is dependent on the students, the faculty, and the support staff it attracts and develops. The institution's purposes should be reflected in its student recruiting and admissions policies, as well as in the educational and other support services it provides to the students it enrolls. Its expectations of those students and its view of their potential for achievement must realistically consider the level of ability they bring with them. High school grades, class rank, the results of standardized aptitude tests and achievement tests, recommendations from high school personnel and others, evidence of special interests and abilities, personal qualities revealed in interviews—these and other measures of student readiness are commonly employed to assess that ability. There is no single standardized test score, etc., that every institution should use in its admissions decisions, but the criteria it does use should be consistent with its purposes, and with its instructional and other resources.

The quality of its faculty and instructional staff is also critical to an institution's ability to achieve its purposes. The faculty and staff it recruits must be competent to accomplish the purposes the institution has set for itself. Therefore, the particular kinds of competencies the institution will seek in potential faculty and staff will vary according to its particular character and purposes. Proficiency in classroom teaching, for example, is often regarded as more significant in undergraduate programs than in graduate schools, where a scholar-apprentice relationship prevails. Institutions preparing their students to enter occupations will usually be more interested in selecting faculty on the basis of their work experience and occupational proficiency than on their having advanced degrees. Academically oriented institutions, on the other hand, will emphasize possession of such degrees. Research oriented institutions will emphasize research competence. The point is that the recruitment of faculty should be consistent with the institution's stated purposes, and so should its criteria for making tenure and promotion decisions.

The other groups of instructional and support staff—learning resources, admissions and financial aid, counseling—should also be selected and evaluated on qualifications that are consistent with the purposes of the institution as a whole as well as their specific components of it.

Financial Resources. Finances are not quite as simple as they were in Charles Dickens' day, but Mr. Micawber's advice to David Copperfield is still worth remembering: "Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure nineteen and six, result happiness. Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure twenty pounds and six, result misery. The blossom is blighted, the leaf is withered, the god of day goes down upon the dreary scene, and—in short, you are floored."

An institution must have adequate financial support, properly administered, to provide the instructional and other services which are called for in its stated purposes. It should also be able to demonstrate that the stability of its sources of income, its budgeting, its accounting procedures and its audits reflect sound financial practices.

The budget of an institution is a key document in evaluating it since, if properly constructed, it expresses the institution's priorities and plans. The institution's balance sheet and operating statement are also central to evaluating its financial management. They complement the budget since, while the budget is an expression of the institution's immediate priorities and plans, its financial reports, if properly prepared, are a gauge of its past priorities and achievements and a projection and basis for its future.

It is impossible to establish generally applicable levels of acceptable income and expenditures that are valid for all institutions; in fact, it is not even possible to establish such levels for all institutions of the same type. Instead, the financial structure of each institution must be evaluated in terms of the resources it provides for the institution to accomplish its purposes, and the efficiency with which those resources are administered.

There is no single pattern of "correct" distribution of income from various sources (tuition and fees, legislative appropriations, endowment earnings, annual gifts, grants from government and other sources, research contracts). An analysis of the trends evident in the distribution of an institution's sources of income, however, can be extremely useful in understanding its financial situation. Similarly, there is no one pattern of expenditures that may be considered best, but an analysis of how the institution spends its funds clearly has meaning for evaluating its commitment to realizing its stated purposes.

Physical Resources. The physical plant, including buildings, grounds, maintenance, and equipment on-campus as well as off- should also be evaluated in terms of the Criteria; as should instructional resources such as the library and laboratories. These physical resources must be adequate to accomplish the institution's purposes, and the institution should be able to provide evidence of their effectively doing so.

Organization

Self-studies should also evaluate an institution's governance, organization and administration, since its evaluation, decision-making and planning processes are as critical to an institution's success as its students or faculty.

Patterns of institutional governance vary from institution to institution as do mechanisms for decision-making and implementation of those decisions. An institution's evaluation must include a careful examination of its organizational structure and that organization's effectiveness. The obligations and responsibilities of each of the elements of the institutional community should be clear; so should the relationship between the administration and the institution's governing board or boards. In the United States, the ultimate governing authority of most institutions rests with lay boards representative of the public interest as well as the interests of particular constituencies. The function of the board is to establish broad policies for the institution; translating those policies into action is the responsibility of the administration and the faculty. An institution's self-evaluation should relate its particular governing structure to its purposes, and should examine that structure's relationship to the institution's ability to accomplish those purposes.

The increasing cost and complexity of higher education have often led supporting groups, both public and private, to establish coordinating boards. The aim of these boards is often to increase the efficiency with which the supporting group's funds are spent. The extent to which such governing boards take part in the governance of the institution varies. But in cases where such boards exist the basic integrity of the individual institutions governed by them should be assured.

Programs

An institution's programs are central to the task of fulfilling its mission and purposes. An evaluation of the programs should also be included in the self-study.

In reviewing the basic academic programs, the self-study process should include assessment of such things as appropriateness, rigor, and viability of major degree programs; the breadth of supporting academic programs (minors, core curriculum, general education, developmental courses); and the level of institutional support (faculty, facilities, etc.) for the programs. Such a review should include as well an evaluation of the major documents which delineate the educational programs—catalog descriptions, program brochures, course syllabi—to assure that the documents are accurate and useful. How an institution evaluates these programs, how it develops new curricula, and how it assures the adequacy of its overall educational offerings in fulfilling its mission and purposes—these, too, should be included in the self-study.

Depending on the character of the institution, other major programs might figure prominently in the self-study. Some institutions, for example, conduct widespread continuing education programs while others have or are developing special programs for the adult learner. Study abroad programs or opportunities often are an integral part of an institution's educational opportunities. Athletics may or may not be integrated into the curriculum, but frequently they have a sizeable impact on the institution. These programs should not be forgotten or passed over lightly in the self-study process.

Support programs, particularly those involving student services and learning resources, should receive careful attention. The effort to measure the adequacy of such programs will vary from institution to institution: residential campuses will differ markedly from commuter campuses, for example, and research universities will have needs other than those found in vocational-technical institutes. Often institutions consider development and alumni programs critical to their well-being, and an assessment of them should be included in the self-study.

Accomplishment of Purposes

Self-Study requires that an institution assess its effectiveness in using available resources to accomplish its purposes. This aspect of the evaluation, sometimes decribed as output analysis, requires that the institution gather evidence of *outcomes*. It is not enough to demonstrate clarity and appropriateness of purpose or adequacy of

resources and organization: the institution must be able to demonstrate positive results.

A self-study evaluates a broad range of outcomes in order to determine the effectiveness of its organization, of its educational program, of its student services, etc. One of the most important outcomes of every postsecondary educational institution will be its students' achievements in relation to its purposes. The measures institutions use to assess that achievement will vary according to their purposes. Some institutions place greatest emphasis on intellectual growth; others, on acquisition of skills; still others, on inculcation of values. Each will need to use appropriate techniques to evaluate its students' achievement of its intended outcomes.

Measuring educational outcomes is, admittedly, an inexact science, but a variety of techniques have been used effectively by institutions engaged in self-study and evaluation. Results of standardized tests may be useful; (but because institutions differ, comparison of the test scores of one institution's students with those of another's must be made with caution.) The progress its students make toward meeting *its* stated goals is the critical measure of an institution's accomplishment. Follow-up studies of graduates are also useful measures of institutional effectiveness. If the institution's purposes include preparing students for further education, for example, data on the number of its students who continue their education, the schools they attend, and their performance are indicators of its effectiveness. If the institution's purposes include preparing students for employment, data on job placement and job performance may be used. Pre-testing and post-testing may also be appropriate measures of achievement.

In the final analysis, an educational institution's basic concern is to move its students as far as possible toward a set of desired goals. Accomplishing this often depends on achieving other goals within the institution. For example, an institution may view faculty and staff development as integral to achieving its primary objectives. The self-study should also address accomplishment of such related goals. The administration and the faculty, as well as the several offices of the administration, should function smoothly and harmoniously. And the policies governing various aspects of the institution's work—

admissions and retention, instructional programs, student services, faculty evaluation—need to be consistent with its purposes.

The total range of influences which bear on a student's growth toward desired outcomes are more generally recognized today than they once were. Consequently, evaluating an institution's success in accomplishing its purposes will usually involve assessing a wide variety of structured and unstructured, curricular and extracurricular experiences. It will also require studying how each facet of the institution is actually contributing to those experiences.

Continuity and Planning

As indicated earlier in this *Guide*, an institution can only continue to accomplish its purposes if it remains alert to the opportunities and problems that it must confront. Self-study should help to identify and develop the plans and structures to meet these opportunities and dangers; it should also evaluate the planning and structures for coping with change that the institution has already established.

Effective planning structures provide the means for modifying goals, developing programs, altering methods of instruction, coping with shifting levels and sources of support, and evaluating institutional vitality. Continuing self-analysis is crucial to establishing and maintaining such structures.

Evaluation of the institution's history and current status, the trends affecting and likely to affect it, the needs and priorities it has established for itself, and the plans and processes it has in place to deal with the future should demonstrate that the institution can continue to accomplish its purposes.

IV. Reporting The Self-Study

The Purposes of the Report

One of the products of the self-study for candidacy or accreditation is a self-study report which has several specific purposes. It serves as an institution's formal application for initial or continued candidacy or accreditation; it demonstrates the institution's ability to analyze its effectiveness and develop plans for its own improvement; it provides evidence that the institution fulfills the Commission's Criteria for Candidacy or Criteria for Accreditation; and it succinctly summarizes information necessary for the on-site evaluation, the review process, and Commission action.

The Three Essential Elements

Because the design of each institution's self-study will differ, no single outline for the self-study report is prescribed by the Commission. But every self-study report must contain three essential elements. These elements may be organized and presented in any number of ways, and each institution is encouraged to organize its report in the manner best suited to its own purposes and needs. But, however the report is organized, it *must* include:

- an introduction containing certain matters of information, including the Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status
- a description and evaluation of the institution in terms of the Criteria
- a summary assessment of the institution which explicitly addresses each of the Criteria for Candidacy or Accreditation

The First Essential Element

The first essential element of every self-study report is a clear, concise introduction which provides certain matters of information that give the reader a context within which to read what follows. This introduction should describe:

- the organization of the report
- the purposes of the report
- the self-study process which led to the report

- the accreditation history of the institution, concluding with the **Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status**
- how the report will present the institution's responses to the last NCA report
- significant changes since the last evaluation
- unusual aspects of the institution

The purposes of the report should be specified at the outset, so that readers will know how to appproach what follows. One purpose will be to gain or continue candidacy or accreditation, but there may be other purposes as well. For example, after consulting with the Commission, an institution may wish to incorporate development of a long-range plan into its self-study process and report. Purposes such as this should be indicated and explained.

The self-study process which led to the report must be outlined. How committees were established and staffed, the methods used to insure broad participation in the process, any special or unique features of the self-study plan should all be discussed.

The introduction should summarize the institution's accreditation history. The report need not include every detail of this history—especially if the institution has long been affiliated with the Commission—but it should specify when the institution first became affiliated with the Commission, when it was first accredited, when it last underwent a comprehensive evaluation, and when focused evaluations (if any) have been conducted since the last comprehensive evaluation. This summary of the institution's accreditation history should conclude with a copy of the **Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status** *for the visit, which indicates any changes that the institution is requesting.*

Since the visiting team receives copies of the last comprehensive Team Report and formal institutional response, as well as copies of subsequent focused reports and formal responses, the institution should inform the team of where and how the current report will treat concerns identified by previous Commission reviews. The report may treat the institution's subsequent actions to eliminate or alleviate those concerns in a variety of ways—in the introduction itself, as part of the sections of the report devoted to the areas to which the concerns were relevant,

in a separate chapter—but the way the concerns will be addressed in the report should be described at the outset.

The Commission's requirement that all institutions affiliated with it be evaluated periodically is partially designed to monitor the changes that institutions undergo. Significant changes that have occurred since the last comprehensive evaluation should be explained in the introduction so that the visiting team will understand the current character of the institution.

The self-study report should orient the team to the special qualities which the institution feels distinguish it. The better informed they are about these qualities when they approach the self-study report and the on-site evaluation, the better able the team members will be to examine the institution in terms of its own mission and purposes.

The Second Essential Element

The body of the self-study report is a description and evaluation of the institution in terms of the Commission's Criteria for Candidacy or Accreditation. However it is organized, this part of the report must demonstrate that the institution meets the appropriate Evaluative Criteria by describing and assessing the institution's mission and purposes, its resources and organization to accomplish its purposes, the evidence that it is, in fact, accomplishing its purposes, and the evidence that it can continue to accomplish its purposes. The Evaluative Criteria are discussed in Chapters III and IV in *A Handbook of Accreditation*. The institution must also demonstrate that it meets the thirteen General Institutional Requirements. The General Institutional Requirements are discussed in Chapter II of the *Handbook*.

The Third Essential Element

The third essential element of every self-study report is a summary section. This section should highlight the evidence presented in the report which directly relates to the institution's demonstration that it fulfills the Criteria. It may also *briefly* summarize the strengths and concerns the self-study has revealed and *briefly* describe the plans for action and/or the actions that have already grown out of the self-study process.

Organization of the Report

One way of organizing the chapters in the body of the report is to examine the institution in an order that logically relates to the elements addressed in the appropriate Criteria. Such an organization might have a Table of Contents such as this:

Part I. Introduction
(see First Essential Element, p. 18)

Part II. The Criteria for Accreditation
(see Second Essential Element, p. 20)
A. General Institutional Requirements
B. Evaluative Criteria

- Mission and Purposes
- Programs of Instruction
- Students and Student Services
- Faculty
- Instructional Support Services (Library, Learning Resources, Auxiliary Enterprises)
- Research and Scholarly Activities
- Financial Resources and Operations
- Physical Facilities
- Community Resources
- Institutional Dynamics (Governance, Administration, Organization for Decision-Making, Evaluation and Planning)

Part III. Summary
(see Third Essential Element, p. 20)

An approach to preparing this report might be to examine each of these areas by addressing its purposes, resources, outcomes, strengths and concerns, and plans for action based on its self-assessment.

Another approach might be to organize the report by criterion. Such an organization for a self-study for accreditation might have a Table of Contents such as this:

Introduction
(see First Essential Element, p. 18)
The Criteria for Accreditation
(see Second Essential Element, p. 20)

- **General Institutional Requirements**
- **Evaluative Criterion One**
  - — Mission and Purposes

- **Evaluative Criterion Two**
  - — Resources: Human
  - — Resources: Financial
  - — Resources: Physical
  - — Educational Programs
  - — Support Services
  - — Administration & Governance
- **Evaluative Criterion Three**
  - — Assessment of Outcomes
  - — Strengths and Concerns
  - — Plans for Improvement
- **Evaluative Criterion Four**
  - — Planning Processes
  - — Evidence of Institutional Continuity

Summary Assessment
(see Third Essential Element, p. 20)

The Table of Contents for a self-study for candidacy organized on this model might be:

Introduction
(see First Essential Element, p. 18)
The Criteria for Candidacy for Accreditation
(see Second Essential Element, p. 20)

- **General Institutional Requirements**
- **Evaluative Criterion One**
  - — Mission and Purposes
  - — Immediate
  - — Long Range
- **Evaluative Criterion Two**
  - — Organization
  - — Resources: Human
  - — Resources: Financial
  - — Resources: Physical
  - — Educational Programs
  - — Support Services
  - — Evidence of Effectiveness in Meeting Immediate Purposes
- **Evaluative Criterion Three**
  - — Plans for Development
  - — Timetable for Development
  - — Additional Resources to be Acquired

- **Evaluative Criterion Four**
  - — Evaluation in Relation to the Criteria for Accreditation
  - — Progress toward Meeting the Criteria for Accreditation Since the Last Evaluation
  - — Timetable for Achieving Accreditation

Summary Assessment

(see Third Essential Element, p. 20)

There are any number of other approaches and outlines that would work as well or better than these in a particular case. But—whatever the approach—description and evaluation of the institution within the framework of the Criteria must be the focus.

Writing the Report

The report should be a well-written, readable *narrative*, not a collection of tables, charts and graphs. It should be a concise yet thorough *summary* of the findings of the self-study process, not a point-by-point or questionnaire-by-questionnaire replication of it. It should be written with the other materials its readers will have access to in mind. Since the self-study report is a part of a set of materials—which includes Basic Institutional Data Forms, faculty and student handbooks, and the catalog—it need not repeat at length information that its readers will find elsewhere. (For a list of the documents for comprehensive and focused evaluations, see *Handbook*, pp. 37-38.)

It is not necessary to provide a course list when that already appears in the catalog. Nor is it necessary, for example, to provide an elaborate description of personnel policies or faculty committees that are detailed in the faculty handbook. The report should briefly summarize such information and refer its readers to the document in which it appears in full for elaboration. Statistical information should be treated in the same fashion: the report should *summarize* and *interpret* rather than reproduce it. Supporting information and data may be included in appendices or catalogued in an annotated bibliography of materials that will be available to team members when they are on campus. The report is the institution's clear presentation of its case for candidacy or accreditation—a case that demonstrates that it has engaged in thorough self-evaluation and has found that it meets the Commission's Criteria. It is a self-portrait—in the institution's own style and painted against a background of the Criteria.

In order to provide a statistical base for the evaluation and to create a thumbnail sketch of the institution's status, each institution is required to complete a set of **Basic Institutional Data Forms.** These forms, which are sent to the institution by the Commission with the one year reminder letter, ask for certain kinds of quantitative information which assists the team in its qualitative evaluation. The forms may be bound into the self-study report as an appendix or may be submitted separately.

V. Aids For Self-Study

While each steering committee will need to design and conduct its self-study in the way it feels is most appropriate to its institution, most steering committees find some guidance from the Commission valuable as they begin their planning. This chapter is intended to offer such guidance in the context of the rest of this *Guide*. Based on the experience and research of the Commission's staff, it suggests several ways of approaching the task of gathering the information necessary to make the evaluative judgments a self-study requires, and concludes with a description of sample self-study materials available from the Commission and/or institutions that have recently completed a self-study process.

Two Approaches to the Self-Study

One approach to conducting the self-study is to divide the institution into its functional areas and then examine each area in relation to the **Evaluative Criteria.** This approach is essentially cumulative: it begins by examining the institution's mission and purposes for clarity and appropriateness, and proceeds to demonstrate that the institution meets the Commission's other Evaluative Criteria by examining each of its components through an inquiry which focuses on:

- *identifying the purposes* of the area and their congruence with the institution's purposes
- *describing* the area, and *demonstrating the adequacy* of its resources, programs and organization for achieving its purposes
- *assessing* the area, including identifying its strengths and concerns and providing evidence of its effectiveness
- and *developing plans* based on this assessment of the area that will enhance its strengths, alleviate its concerns, and insure its ability to continue to accomplish its purposes.

In its summary assessment, the self-study report integrates this information about its components into an

evaluation of the institution as a whole which demonstrates that *the institution meets the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation or Criteria for Candidacy, including the General Institutional Requirements and the Evaluative Criteria.*

The report of a self-study conducted in this way will often use a Table of Contents such as the one outlined on p. 21.

Another approach to evaluating the institution in relation to the Commission's Criteria is one which is divided by the Criteria rather than by the institution's functional components. In this approach the components of the institution are subordinated to the Criteria. In order to gather the information necessary to write a report organized in this way, questions such as the following may be considered:

CRITERION ONE

The institution has clear and publicly stated purposes, consistent with its mission and appropriate to a postsecondary educational institution.

1. How do the institution's mission and purposes relate to the basic charter or statutes?
2. How does the institution support its claim that its mission and purposes are appropriate to a postsecondary institution?
3. How does the institution review and revise its mission and purposes?
4. To what extent are the mission and purposes clearly and consistently stated for students, faculty, administration, governing boards and the community at large?
5. In what ways can the institution relate its educational programs and activities to its stated mission and purposes?
6. In what ways do the mission and purposes enhance or inhibit processes of change?

CRITERION TWO

The institution has effectively organized adequate human, financial and physical resources into educational and other programs to accomplish its purposes.

Governance and Administration

1. How is the institution governed?
2. How has governance changed over time?

3. In what ways does the system of governance assist or hinder the institution in carrying out its mission and purposes?
4. What is the administrative structure of the institution?
5. How has this structure changed over time?
6. In what ways does it assist or hinder the institution in carrying out its mission and purposes?

Human Resources

1. What are the characteristics of the institution's human resources—Students, Instructional Staff, Administrative Staff, Support Staff, Governing Boards? (Descriptive characteristics may include number, gender, age, academic or experiential background, degrees, aptitudes, and others.)
2. How have these characteristics changed over time?
3. In what ways do these characteristics assist or hinder the institution in carrying out its mission and purposes?

Financial Resources

1. What are the characteristics of the institution's financial resources? (Include sources, amounts, allocation and reallocation; budgetary procedures, and others.)
2. How have these characteristics changed over time?
3. In what ways do the current financial resources assist or hinder the institution in meeting its needs and in carrying out its mission and purposes?

Physical Resources
(Including Library, Instructional Resources and Laboratories)

1. What are the characteristics of the physical facilities and equipment of the institution?
2. How have these characteristics changed over time?
3. In what ways do they assist or hinder the institution in meeting its needs and in carrying out its mission and purposes?

Educational Programs and Curriculum

1. What are the characteristics of the educational programs and learning experiences at the institution? (Be sure to include study abroad programs, intercollegiate athletics, off-campus programs, special programs offered only at certain times of the year, etc.)
2. How have these characteristics changed over time?
3. In what ways do these programs and learning experiences assist or hinder the institution in meeting its needs and in carrying out its mission and purposes?

Institutional Services

1. What services does the institution provide to develop and improve its human resources (i.e., student services, faculty and staff development programs)?
2. How have these services changed over time?
3. In what ways do these services assist or hinder the institution in carrying out its mission and purposes?
4. What services does the institution provide to the communities of which it is a part (the local community, professional groups)?
5. How have these services changed over time?
6. In what ways do these services assist or hinder the institution in carrying out its mission and purposes?

CRITERION THREE

The institution is accomplishing its purposes.

Quality of Student Achievement

1. How does the institution define the quality of student achievement needed to fulfill its mission and purposes?
2. How does the institution measure the quality of student achievement (e.g., transcripts, placement records, test scores, graduate follow-up studies, etc.)?
3. How do those measurements help to confirm the institution's claim that it is accomplishing its purposes?

Quality of Administrative and Educational Services

1. How does the institution define the quality of administrative and educational services needed to fulfill its mission and purposes?
2. How does the institution measure the quality of administrative and educational services (e.g., research, publications, inservice training, performances, evaluations, awards, evidence of due process and academic freedom, etc.)
3. How do those measurements help to confirm the institution's claim that it is accomplishing its purposes?

Quality of Institutional Life

1. How does the institution define the quality of institutional life needed to fulfill its mission and purposes?
2. How does the institution measure the quality of institutional life (e.g., retention of students and faculty, student and faculty morale, alumni responsiveness, etc.)?
3. How do those measurements help to confirm the institution's claim that it is accomplishing its purposes?

Quality of Contribution to Outside Communities

1. How does the institution define the quality of its contribution to outside communities needed to fulfill its mission and purposes?
2. How does the institution measure the quality of its contribution to outside communities (e.g., community support, professional offices held, etc.)?
3. How do these measurements help to confirm the institution's claim that it is accomplishing its purposes?

CRITERION FOUR

The institution can continue to accomplish its purposes.

Past and Present Experience

1. How does the history of the institution help to demonstrate that it can continue to accomplish its purposes in the future?
2. How do the current characteristics of the institution help to support the claim that it can continue to accomplish its purposes?

Plans for the Future

1. What plans does the institution have to maintain or enhance its human, physical, and financial resources?
2. What changes in organization, programs and services does the institution foresee and how does it plan to effect those changes?
3. How do these plans help demonstrate that the institution can continue to accomplish its purposes?

Continuing Planning Processes

1. How will the institution's planning processes assist it to meet future needs?
2. How does the institution evaluate its planning processes?

The report of a self-study conducted with this approach will often use a Table of Contents such as the one outlined on pp. 21-22.

Either of these approaches will require that the self-study committee gather extensive data about the institution and its component parts—data that can be used to draw conclusions about the *institution's* fulfillment of the Criteria. Because the Commission provides no list of "standards" against which an institution can measure itself, self-study

committees often wonder what kinds of specific questions they need to answer to evaluate their institution against the Commission's Criteria, and what kinds of questions visiting teams ask to make their determination that the Criteria are met.

The Commission staff has conducted research designed to help answer these questions. As a result of that research, the staff has compiled a list of specific questions that visiting teams have indicated they consider important. These questions, organized into "schedules" treating various areas of institutional life, are presented here as a *tool* for gathering data. An institution's steering committee may wish to use them as the core of a fuller set of questions appropriate to its own self-study design; or it may use some of them and discard others. **They are not exhaustive; and answering them is not, in itself, sufficient evidence that the institution fulfills the Commission's Criteria. The schedules are not standards which must be used, but one way to gather information during the self-study.** And once information is gathered about the institution and its components it must be **related** to how the institution meets the Commission's Criteria.

SCHEDULE I
AREA: INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND PURPOSES

Sources of Information: Charter or statutes; catalog; master planning document; board and faculty minutes; public relations documents; recruitment brochures

Questions to consider:

1. Are the institution's educational programs and learning experiences clearly related to its mission and purposes?
2. Are the mission and purposes appropriate to a postsecondary educational institution?
3. Are the mission and purposes considered in decisions concerning curriculum and instructional methods?
4. Are there ambiguities or unclear goals in the statement of mission and purposes?
5. Does the institution express its mission and purposes consistently in its documents?

SCHEDULE II
AREA: INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE

Sources of Information: Charter; bylaws; board members; operating procedures; governing board newsletters; contracts

Questions to consider:

1. Do the members of the governing board understand and support the mission and purposes of the institution?
2. What is the relationship of the governing board to the chief executive officer of the institution?
3. What is the distinction between policy making and administration?
4. In what ways do the functions of the governing board assist the institution in achieving its mission and purposes?
5. Are adequate records of meetings of the governing board and its committees maintained and available for examination?
6. Are members of the governing board sufficiently informed about the functions of the institution to carry out their responsibilities?
7. Is there appropriate codification and publication of the policies and procedures of the governing boards?

SCHEDULE III
AREA: INSTITUTIONAL ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

Sources of Information: Organizational charts; job descriptions; appropriate board and faculty minutes; evaluations of administrators; personnel files

Questions to consider:

1. Do administrative policies and performance contribute to the achievement of the institution's mission?
2. Is the institution's organization clear and well-defined?
3. Does the institution function in the manner described in its organizational chart?
4. Does this organizational structure contribute to the institution's ability to achieve its mission and objectives?
5. Does the administrative staff possess the necessary competencies to carry out its tasks in the institution effectively?
6. Are administrative policies codified adequately?
7. Are the decision-making processes understood by the various components of the institution's community?
8. Is there evidence that the administrative staff comprehends and is able to address the range of problems confronting the institution?

SCHEDULE IV
AREA: FACULTY AND INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF RESOURCES

Sources of Information: Faculty handbook; faculty minutes; personnel files; faculty evaluations; appropriate board minutes; Basic Institutional Data Form C

Questions to consider:

1. Is the preparation (academic training and/or experience) of the full- and part-time instructional staff appropriate to the institution's educational programs?
2. Does the institution operate with clearly defined, well understood, and appropriate personnel policies for its instructional staff, e.g., recruitment, hiring, termination, promotion, tenure, retention, contractual relationship?
3. Does the institution have appropriate policies and procedures to provide academic freedom and due process to its instructional staff?
4. Is the instructional staff of sufficient size and diversity to carry out the institution's educational programs?
5. Are all members of the instructional staff employed in areas for which they have been trained?
6. How does the institution evaluate the teaching effectiveness of its instructional staff (full-time, adjunct, and part-time)?
7. Are there clear institutional guidelines and/or policies relating to work assignments (i.e., course load, advising, committee work, etc.)?
8. Does the institution provide appropriate opportunities for instructional staff development?
9. At what levels and through what mechanisms are the instructional staff involved in institutional decision-making?

SCHEDULE V
AREA: FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Sources of Information: Budget; audits; Basic Institutional Data Form D; reports of business and development offices; financial master plans; corporate reports

Questions to consider:

1. By what mechanism(s) does the institution assess its financial condition?
2. How are the results of that assessment used?
3. Are adequate funds available to service debts?
4. Does the institution have a financial history that demonstrates its ability to fund its educational programs and services?
5. Has the institution balanced its budget?
6. How regularly and systematically does the institution assess its financial condition?

7. In the past has the institution engaged in successful development programs (endowment, gifts and grants)?
8. Are there well-defined administrative policies for generating fiscal resources?
9. Has the institution established a financial management system to support the achievement of its mission?
10. By what plans and procedures does the institution manage its various fiscal components?
11. Does the institution's budget process contribute to efficient allocation, expenditure and reallocation of resources?
12. Does the financial program reflect the policies of the governing board?
13. What is the ratio and structure of indebtedness to assets?
14. Is the institution's financial plan related to educational program developments?
15. Are the charts of accounts and accounting procedures appropriate and do they follow generally accepted principles devised for these purposes?

SCHEDULE VI
AREA: RECRUITING AND ADMITTING STUDENTS

Sources of Information: Catalogs; recruiting brochures; alumni bulletins; admissions office records; transcripts; appropriate committee, faculty or board minutes; planning documents; Basic Institutional Data Form A

Questions to consider:

1. Does the institution have well-defined policies and procedures for recruitment which are consistent with its mission and purposes?
2. Does the institution make readily available to the public documents which explain fully and clearly policies and procedures for admission, financial aid, payment, grading, and requirements for program completion?
3. Does the institution have operational admissions policies and procedures?
4. Do the people responsible for admissions apply the institution's policies and procedures consistently?
5. How are recruitment and admissions policies and procedures adapted to meet institutional needs?

SCHEDULE VII
AREA: STUDENT SERVICES

Sources of Information: Student handbook; catalog; faculty handbook; job descriptions; student evaluations; organizational charts; informational brochures; student publications

Questions to consider:

1. Does the training and experience of the student services staff prepare them to carry out their tasks?

2. Does the staff have good working relationships with student groups?
3. Do student services programs—counseling, advising, financial aid, placement, and so forth—reflect the mission of the institution and meet the needs of students (including adult learners, veterans, minorities, the handicapped, and exceptional students)?
4. Is there good communication within and among the student services offices?

SCHEDULE VIII
AREA: LEARNING RESOURCES, (LIBRARY, MEDIA CENTER, INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES CENTER)

Sources of Information: Budget; library inventory; Basic Institutional Data Form E; printed leaflets and brochures; personnel files; interlibrary agreements

Questions to consider:

1. Does the institution possess—or provide ready access to—learning resources adequate to its educational programs?
2. Does the acquisition program enable the institution to keep pace with educational program development and also to maintain the range and distribution of holdings?
3. Are the learning resources used effectively by faculty and students?
4. Is the usage of learning resources consistent with the educational goals of the institution?
5. Does the institution provide adequate financial support to maintain the quality of its learning resources?

SCHEDULE IX (A)
AREA: EDUCATIONAL AND LEARNING EXPERIENCES – CURRICULUM

Sources of Information: Catalog; curriculum review studies; course syllabi; appropriate faculty and board minutes; evaluation of instruction; Basic Institutional Data Form F

Questions to consider:

1. Is the pattern of requirements for degrees, diplomas, or certificates outlined suitably in appropriate institutional documents?
2. Does the institution use instructional methods consistent with its mission and appropriate to its clientele?
3. What resource constraints have a direct impact on the institution's programs?
4. Do the instructional programs prepare students to be proficient in their selected disciplines, career areas or other chosen fields?
5. Is the instructional program effectively administered?
6. Is the curriculum based on an explicit rationale?
7. Does the institution recognize and reward superior teaching performance?
8. Does the institution provide an adequate advising system for students?

9. Do the institution's physical facilities provide sufficient and appropriate space for current program needs?

SCHEDULE IX (B)
AREA: EDUCATIONAL AND LEARNING EXPERIENCES – CONTINUING EDUCATION, OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS (Including Military Sites), EVENING, WEEKEND AND MULTI-CAMPUS DEGREE PROGRAMS; STUDY ABROAD

Sources of Information: Catalogs; brochures; contracts; program evaluations

Questions to consider:

1. How does the institution or a department determine the qualifications of the instructional staff?
2. Are the standards for awarding credit the same as those used for students enrolled in on-campus programs?
3. In these programs does the institution use instructional methods consistent with its mission and appropriate to the student clientele?
4. Are the standards for awarding grades for a course the same as on-campus?
5. Is the institution's purpose in providing continuing education and/or off-campus programs clearly defined and directly related to the institutional statement of mission?
6. What hiring and evaluation policies and procedures insure that adjunct and/or part-time faculty are equivalent in competency to on-campus faculty?
7. Does the institution provide-or guarantee access to-learning resources (libraries, special equipment, labs) appropriate to these courses and programs?
8. Does the institution offering credit courses provide to prospective and enrolled students information concerning admissions procedures, financial aid, and all course requirements?
9. Do credit courses carry the same course number, represent the same course content, and require the same level of performance as those programs and courses offered on-campus? If not, are equivalent numbers, content and procedures used?
10. What procedures are used to insure that adjunct and/or part-time faculty understand and implement the achievement standards of the institution?
11. Is credit recorded on the transcript in the same manner as for students enrolled on-campus?
12. Through what administrative organization does the institution monitor the quality of these programs?
13. Do students enrolled meet the same admissions standards as for on-campus students?

SCHEDULE IX (C)
AREA: EDUCATIONAL AND LEARNING EXPERIENCES – GRADUATE EDUCATION, TEACHING, RESEARCH AND OTHER SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Sources of Information: Catalogs; brochures; records of publications; budget; Basic Institutional Data Form F; grants and contracts; dissertations; research reports; appropriate board and faculty minutes

Questions to consider:

1. Are the objectives for graduate education, teaching, research and other scholarly activities well defined and consistent with the mission of the institution?
2. Are the faculty, staff, and students well-qualified for teaching, research and other scholarly activities?
3. What financial resources are available to support teaching, research and other scholarly work?
4. Are adequate library and research facilities readily accessible to support an appropriate level of research, teaching and other scholarly activities?
5. Are the teaching, research and other scholarly activities of the faculty, staff and students of acceptible quality and quantity?
6. How does the institution plan the future of its graduate education and research functions to account for the problems and opportunities it might encounter?
7. Does the institution recognize teaching, research and other scholarly functions in its policies on promotion, teaching assignments and other responsibilities?
8. Are appropriately high standards of graduate education, teaching, research and other scholarly activities articulated and encouraged?
9. What equipment, supplies and facilities are provided for teaching, research, and other scholarly activities?
10. Through what mechanism does the institution systematically and critically review ongoing and new graduate programs?

SCHEDULE IX (D)
AREA: EDUCATIONAL AND LEARNING EXPERIENCES – EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

Sources of Information: Catalogs, brochures, transcripts, contracts, portfolios, appropriate faculty and board minutes, program statements

Questions to consider:

1. Does the institution provide clear guidelines as to what it considers college-level learning?
2. Are the objectives of the activities or program(s) of experiential learning consistent with the mission of the institution?
3. Is credit for experiential learning offered only in areas where the institution is competent to judge quality?

4. Can the institution provide a clear rationale for crediting particular types of learning or competencies for particular degree, diploma or certificate programs?
5. Are the objectives of the activities and program(s) of experiential learning clearly defined?
6. Does the institution employ appropriate *measurements* methods to assess experiential learning?
7. Are learning outcomes specified with sufficient clarity and specificity so they can be communicated to students and assessors and be validly assessed?
8. Are adequate financial resources available to attain the stated objectives?
9. Has the institution identified the types of learning or competencies for which it will award credit?
10. In the award of experiential learning credit is care taken to assure that students will meet all degree requirements, e.g., general education, lower division and upper division requirements?
11. Does the institution have clear policies as to what types of *documentation* are required for evaluating learning and what function such documentation is intended to serve?
12. Is the role of faculty dominant in the documentation process?
13. Is the role of faculty dominant in the assessment process?
14. Has the expertise of assessors been verified?
15. Are the modes of assessment appropriate to the competence and learning being credited?
16. Is the documentation appropriate to the learning and competence being evaluated?
17. Are multiple forms of assessment employed?
18. Is the basis for translating learning outcomes into credit hours specified?
19. Is credit for learning appropriately recorded and in a manner appropriate to the learning?

SCHEDULE X
AREA: EVALUATING AND CERTIFYING STUDENTS

Sources of Information: Registrar files; transcripts; evaluation exams; institutional research data; alumni records; appropriate faculty minutes

Questions to consider:

1. How does the institution validate the completion of requirements for course work, programs, degrees and diplomas?
2. Are appropriate records and an adequate accounting system of student progress maintained by the institution?
3. How does the institution evaluate student achievement in programs (i.e., GREs, competency exams, etc.)?
4. Does the institution gather, study and use data on students who enroll in and complete its programs (i.e., retention and attrition studies, alumni studies, etc.)?

SCHEDULE XI
AREA: INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING

Sources of Information: Planning documents; appropriate board and faculty minutes; institutional research activities

Questions to consider:

1. Does the institutional planning process take into account the state plan (when appropriate) and is it compatible with it?
2. Are the mission and purposes of the institution translated into objectives sufficiently detailed to provide guidance and direction for the development of the institution's plan?
3. Does the planning process relate to the development of the annual budget?
4. Has the institution established a planning mechanism for the utilization of resources and for future changes and developments?
5. Is the institution's mission reviewed on a periodic basis?
6. Is planning based on an adequate data base?
7. Are appropriate and important constituencies of the institution involved in the planning process?
8. What is the relationship between the institution's planning document and its self-study?
9. How does the institution give evidence that planning is an integral part of its regular and on-going activities?

Sample Self-Study Materials

Representatives of institutions undertaking self-studies often ask for "good examples" from other institutions. Over the past few years, the staff of the Commission has identified and annotated excerpts from a number of such good examples for distribution to institutions that request them.

In making these examples available, the Commission wishes to emphasize *that they are not the only good examples it has received; that these materials are examples, not prescribed models; and that no successful self-study merely replicates the self-study conducted by another institution.* These examples are offered to stimulate each self-study steering committee to develop its own self-study plan and report—a plan and report that are uniquely suited to its own purposes, organization and programs. There is no one "best pattern" for an institutional self-study or report. Institutional representatives should note that any pre-1982 excerpts they may have on hand do not address the Criteria and do not include SAS Worksheets, both of which are now required to be included in the Self-Study Report.

Summaries of the materials currently available for examination have been prepared and are included in the following pages. A sample request form, which may be copied and used to order materials appears on p. 56. Other examples designed to meet specific institutional needs, can be provided on request.

The materials which follow include examples drawn from self-studies for both candidacy and accreditation, and examples from the broad spectrum of institutions affiliated with the Commission. The summaries identify both the purpose of the evaluation for which the materials were prepared and the nature of the institution.

DEVELOPING THE SELF-STUDY PLAN

The development of the self-study prospectus or plan is a critical first step in an institution's process for initiating and completing its self-study effort and developing a report for the Commission. Several self-study plans are available from the Commission as examples.

Plan for Self-Study as Formulated by a Steering Committee at "X" Institution. This example of a self-study plan is presented as a case study to show how an institution develops the purposes and design of its self-study, determines the purposes to be accomplished by the process, and formulates an outline of its self-study report. Priorities for study are identified, steering committee assignments are made, and a timetable is developed for completion of tasks. Critical questions for the self-study process are formulated, data-gathering procedures and analysis, conclusion/verification processes are developed. The process provides for periodic progress reports to the academic community and allows time for integration and synthesis of the report.

Organizing and Conducting Institutional Self-Study. This working paper for the North Central Association Self-Study Institute 1984 includes an overview of institutional self-study and suggestions for organizing the self-study and developing a self-study plan. Self-study plans from a variety of institutions show that representatives of each are well aware of the purposes of institutional self-study and knowledgeable about the Commission's requirements. Procedures for organizing the self-study process and for conducting the self-study are clearly delineated, and an appropriate timetable for completing the process is indicated. A tentative outline of the self-study report is included.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
Tempe, Arizona 85287

Arizona State University is a public, comprehensive, state-supported, coeducational institution, accredited at the doctoral degree-granting level, offering liberal arts, general, teacher preparatory, and professional programs. First accredited: 1931. Enrollment: 29,963.

The materials were selected from the Arizona State University self-study prospectus and Special Topics Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1982-83. Officials of the college have given their permission for these materials to be shared with representatives of other North Central Association institutions engaged in the self-study process. For information on the availability of individual copies of the self-study report, please contact the institution directly.

The Arizona State University self-study materials provide an example of a self-study process focused on selected topics. The institution requested permission to use the occasion of the decennial review to examine selected topics in depth and was given approval to do so, provided the self-study report also included a chapter demonstrating that the institution continues to meet the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation.

The following materials are available from the self-study prospectus and report:

Preliminary Outline of the Self-Study Process for the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. This prospectus indicates the mission of Arizona State, suggests *Building a Great Public University: the Next Decade,* as the theme for the self-study, identifies eleven topics of special interest to be examined in depth during the self-study process, and proposes the organization of the report.

Memoranda. Three memoranda to the various persons and groups concerned with the self-study process—deans, faculty, chairs and directors—explain the purpose and expectations of the self-study process and the evaluation.

Excerpts from the Self-Study Report. The preface, table of contents, and summaries of the topic chapters are included in this excerpt. The Self-Study Report consists of twelve self-contained reports, including an overview document and discrete documents devoted to building faculty quality, strengthening undergraduate programs, promoting research, strengthening library resources, developing the University as a major cultural center, serving students from admission to graduation, serving society, and obtaining financial support from public and private sources. While not all selected topics reports will be this extensive, University officials found their approach to be an ideal way to examine Arizona State's present effectiveness and to plan for the next decade. The overview document sets the stage for the evaluation, demonstrates that the University meets the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation, and summarizes the findings of the topic chapters.

SELECTED SELF-STUDY MATERIALS

ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY

Russellville, Arkansas 72801

Arkansas Tech University is a public institution, accredited at the Master's degree-granting level. First accredited: 1930. Enrollment: 2872.

The materials were selected from Arkansas Tech University's Self-Study Report for a Focused Evaluation to Arkansas Tech University in 1983-84. Officials of the college and team members have given their permission for these materials to be shared with representatives of other North Central Association institutions engaged in the self-study process.

This information is provided because there have been many requests for information about the nature and organization of a focused report. It should be kept in mind that each focused report is unique; only the essential elements required by the Commission (introduction, examination of the area of focus and/or requested change, and summary assessment) are the same.

As part of the Commission action taken following a comprehensive evaluation of Arkansas Tech University in 1980-81, an evaluation was scheduled for 1983-84 focused on several areas of concern noted in the master's degree program: (1) governance procedures for graduate programs, (2) definition of graduate curriculum, (3) support of secondary education graduate programs, (4) faculty overload, and (5) quality of graduate courses. The report is brief (35 pages), and it is organized in the format requested by the Commission.

The following excerpts from the Self-Study Report are available:

Letter of Introduction and Statement of Affiliation Status Worksheet. These indicate the nature of the visit.

Table of Contents. This Table shows how the brief report is organized.

Chapter 1. Introduction. This chapter describes the self-study process and summarizes the steps taken to improve the graduate program.

Chapter 2. An Examination of the Area of Focus. This chapter addresses each area of concern, confirms progress to date, and includes assessment and plans for the future.

Chapter 3. A Summary Assessment of the Area of Focus. This final chapter summarizes the progress made in the graduate program in the areas of concern.

SELECTED SELF-STUDY MATERIALS

DELTA COLLEGE

University Center, Michigan 48710

Delta College is a public, state- and locally-supported institution, accredited at the Associate-degree granting level. First accredited: 1968. Enrollment: 5,799.

The materials were selected from the Delta College Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1983-84. Officials of the college have given their permission for these materials to be shared with representatives of other North Central Association institutions engaged in the self-study process. For information on the availability of individual copies of the self-study report, please contact the institution directly.

Delta College provided a self-study report organized around the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation. Fifteen study committees evaluated functional areas of the institution; each provided a lengthy report which was available for team review. The self-study report "is a concise summary of the fifteen study committee reports, reorganized into a format which responds directly to each of the four evaluative criteria of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education." (p. 93). Each of the larger sections of the report starts with an introduction of overall thrust of the section and the significance of each chapter within the section. Special attention was also given to the physical design of the report.

The following excerpts from the Self-Study Report are available:

Table of Contents, Preface and Acknowledgments, General Introduction. These pages provide a quick overview of the document and an explanation of the self-study process followed at Delta College.

Part IV, Chapters 2, 3, and 7. Human and Financial Resources and Strengths and Concerns. In Part IV of its self-study, Delta College addressed the second criterion for accreditation. These excerpts show how the self-study summarized its human and financial resources; the listing of strengths and concerns summarizes all the chapters within Part IV.

Part VI. Planning: History, Future, and Process. This section of the report, consisting of three smaller chapters, provides evidence that Delta College fulfills the fourth criterion for accreditation.

FINDLAY COLLEGE
Findlay, Ohio 45840

Findlay College is a private, not-for-profit, coeducational institution, accredited at the bachelor's degree-granting level. First accredited: 1933. Enrollment: 986.

The materials were selected from Findlay College's Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1983-84. Officials of the college have given their permission for these materials to be shared with representatives of other North Central Association institutions engaged in the self-study process. For information on the availability of individual copies of the self-study report, please contact the institution directly.

Findlay College had a comprehensive self-study process for the 1983-84 evaluation. A ten-person Steering Committee developed a self-study plan and coordinated an extensive effort of eight task groups. The outcome of this process was a report which the evaluation team commended as effective, factual, and straightforward.

Chapter One of the Self-Study presents the institutional mission and purposes of Findlay College. Succeeding chapters relate explicitly to the mission and purposes and implicitly to the General Institutional Requirements and the Evaluative Criteria. Chapters Two through Nine are structured to include these elements: *Introduction, Purposes, Description, Evaluation, Future Plans, and Conclusion.* Chapter Ten uses the NCA's Criteria for Accreditation as an organizing structure in order to highlight key information from the chapters of the Self-Study.

The following excerpts from the Self-Study Report are available:

Table of Contents. The Table of Contents shows how the report is organized to address the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation.

Introduction. This section identifies the purpose and organization of the self-study, provides an institutional overview, and includes Findlay's accreditation history, Statement of Affiliation Status Worksheet, and responses to the 1979 NCA report.

Chapter One. The Mission and Purpose of Findlay College. This chapter describes the college's broad institutional mission and identifies purposes established in 1976 and reaffirmed in 1980 and 1982.

Chapter Two. Programs of Instruction. This chapter focuses on the college's programs of instruction, including the divisional organization of the curriculum, degree requirements, special programs and changes made in the curriculum between 1978 and 1983.

Chapter Ten. Conclusion: Meeting the Criteria for Accreditation. This concluding chapter provides summary evidence that the college meets the General Institutional Requirements and the Evaluative Criteria of the Commission.

SELECTED SELF-STUDY MATERIALS

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLEGE

St. Peter, Minnesota 56082

Gustavus Adolphus College is a private, coeducational institution, affiliated with the Lutheran Church of America and accredited at the bachelor's degree-granting level. First accredited: 1915. Enrollment: 2300.

The materials were selected from Gustavus Adolphus' Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1982-83. Officials of the college have given their permission for these materials to be shared with representatives of other North Central Association institutions engaged in the self-study process. For information on the availability of individual copies of the self-study report, please contact the institution directly.

Gustavus Adolphus College, founded in 1862 by Swedish Lutheran immigrants, is a church-related liberal arts college which has built on its spiritual and ethnic heritage a strongly traditional institution.

The following excerpts from the Self-Study Report are available:

Preface and Introduction. These sections indicate the purpose of the report, the self-study process (which included departmental self-studies), and a self-study timetable. The introductory section provides a context for the evaluation, indicating changes since the last evaluation. Summary evidence is provided that the college meets the Commission's General Institutional Requirements and Evaluative Criteria.

Institutional Mission. This chapter underscores the unique aspects of the college as a liberal arts institution with an ethnic and religious tradition.

The Academic Program. This chapter describes and assesses the college's calendar, curriculum, and majors, as well as various opportunities for students to study abroad and at other institutions. Internships, the relationship to the Nobel Foundation, and the Honors Program are also included.

Financial Resources. This chapter provides evidence that the college responded to financial concerns in the mid-70's through a carefully developed and applied program which has brought it to its present position of financial stability and sound financial planning.

Outcomes and Prospects. This chapter explicitly addresses the Commission's third and fourth Evaluative Criteria by documenting present effectiveness through a number of "outcome indicators" and by describing and assessing the college's long-range planning efforts.

SELECTED SELF-STUDY MATERIALS

KEARNEY STATE COLLEGE

Kearney, Nebraska 68849

Kearney State College is a public, state-supported, coeducational institution, accredited at the Education Specialist degree-granting level. First accredited: 1916. Enrollment: 5,668.

The materials were selected from the Kearney State College Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1983-84. Officials of the college have given their permission for these materials to be shared with representatives of other North Central Association institutions engaged in the self-study process. For information on the availability of individual copies of the self-study report, please contact the institution directly.

Kearney State College developed a self-study document closely tailored to Commission requirements, with chapters organized around the Criteria for Accreditation. The self-study process invited broad participation, utilizing a steering committee and four task force groups comprised of faculty, administrators, students, trustees, and area citizens. Each academic department did its own self-study.

The report of the on-site evaluation team noted that the entire university community was well aware of the self-study process and supportive of the result. The team found the report to be "a thoroughly accurate and comprehensive review of the institution...a coherent, well-organized, highly readable, and very useful self-study document" already being used as an action plan for the institution.

The following excerpts from the Self-Study Report are available:

Table of Contents. The Table of Contents shows how the report is organized to address the Criteria for Accreditation. It includes an introduction, a series of chapters organized around the criteria, a summary assessment, appendices, and an annotated bibliography.

Chapter I. Introduction to the Self-Study. This chapter provides a context for the evaluation with a brief history of the college and the community it serves, the purposes and organization of the report, the self-study process, the accreditation history and Statement of Affiliation Status Worksheet, response to previous concerns, significant changes, and unusual aspects of the college.

Chapter III. Mission and Purposes. This chapter demonstrates that Evaluative Criterion One is met. It descibes the mission and purposes of the college, shows their clarity and consistency, demonstrates their appropriateness for a postsecondary institution, and examines the college's procedures for review and revision of the mission and purposes.

Chapter VII. Kearney State College: A Summary Assessment. This concluding chapter summarizes the institution's evidence that it has conducted an effective self-study and that it continues to meet the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation.

SELECTED SELF-STUDY MATERIALS

MANCHESTER COLLEGE

North Manchester, Indiana 46962

Manchester College is a private, coeducational institution, accredited at the master's degree granting level. First accredited: 1932. Enrollment: 975.5 (FTE).

The materials were selected from Manchester College Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1982-83. Officials of the college have given their permission for these materials to be shared with representatives of other North Central Association institutions engaged in the self-study process. For information on the availability of individual copies of the self-study report, please contact the institution directly.

The self-study report is a result of a comprehensive evaluation of the total institution, the conduct of which was guided by the study schedules provided by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. Of particular interest in this self-study is Chapter IV, Accomplishing College Purposes. It illustrates how a liberal arts college may focus on measurement of outcomes. It interweaves quantitative and qualitative measures around three categories of outcomes: quality of administrative and educational services, quality of student achievement, and quality of institutional life.

The following excerpts from the Self-Study Report are available:

Table of Contents. This provides an extended outline of the report. It shows how the steering committee used the Criteria for Accreditation to organize the report.

Introduction and Chapter One. These provide a succinct summary of the self-study process at a liberal arts college.

Chapter II. Institutional Mission and Purposes. The mission and purposes are indicated in response to the question, "Does Manchester College have clear and publicly stated purposes, consistent with its mission and appropriate to a postsecondary educational institution?" This chapter is included to show the relationships and treatment of Criterion three and Criterion one for accreditation.

Chapter IV. Accomplishing College Purposes. This chapter constitutes the institution's evidence that it meets the third criterion for accreditation. To be noted particularly is how the institution classified its purposes for the analysis.

SELECTED SELF-STUDY MATERIALS

MENNONITE COLLEGE OF NURSING

Bloomington, IL 61701

Mennonite College of Nursing is a private, not-for-profit, single-purpose institution, with candidacy at the Bachelor's degree-granting level. First granted candidacy: 1984. Enrollment: 28.

The materials were selected from the Mennonite College of Nursing Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for initial candidacy in 1983-84. Officials of the college have given their permission for these materials to be shared with representatives of other North Central Association institutions engaged in the self-study process. For information on the availability of individual copies of the self-study report, please contact the institution directly.

Mennonite College of Nursing provided a report organized around the Criteria for Candidacy. Because the College of Nursing had recently evolved out of the long-lived School of Nursing and because the College program (baccalaureate) was replacing the School program (diploma), the Self-Study report builds on the study and planning that shaped and is continuing to shape those changes. Chapter III: Criterion Two is the largest component of the report.

The following excerpts from the Self-Study Report are available:

Table of Contents and Chapter I: Introduction. These pages provide an overview of the report together with the institution's explanation of how the report was constructed and is to be understood.

Chapter V. Criterion Three. This chapter constitutes the major evaluative component of the report. In it Mennonite assesses its current strengths and concerns. Its plans are outlined in the subsections entitled "Areas of Limitation" and "Areas Requiring Monitoring." Some of the plans emerged from the self-study process while others had been part of the original planning in the major institutional and programmatic change at Mennonite.

SELECTED SELF-STUDY MATERIALS

NORTHWEST COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Powell, Wyoming 82435

Northwest Community College is a public, state-and locally-supported, coeducational institution, accredited at the Associate's degree-granting level. First accredited: 1964. Enrollment: 1,646.

The materials were selected from the Northwest Community College Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1983-84. Officials of the college have given their permission for these materials to be shared with representatives of other North Central Association institutions engaged in the self-study process. For information on the availability of individual copies of the self-study report, please contact the institution directly.

Northwest Community College organized its self-study report around one of the options suggested in *A Guide for Self-Study and Evaluation;* chapters devoted to functional areas of institutional life include description, assessment of effectiveness, and future plans. A summary chapter measures the institution against the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation. The succinct report was accompanied by a separately-bound appendix.

For its self-study process Northwest Community College chose to use existing standing committees instead of structuring new ones. In this way the institution attempted to make efficient use of its human resources and to integrate the self-study process into college-wide biennial planning.

The following excerpts from the Self-Study Report are available:

Chapter I. Introduction. This chapter provides a description of the self-study (its institutional purposes and the process), a history of the institution complete with its accreditation history, responses to the last visiting teams, an outline of changes since the last comprehensive visit, an explanation of unique characteristics of the institution, and a brief assessment of the self-study process. The table of contents is appended.

Chapter II. Mission and Goals. As part of its self-study, Northwest Community College engaged in an extensive process of reviewing and clarifying its mission and goals. This brief chapter summarizes the effort, assesses its effectiveness, and explains how the new mission and goals statements will play a role in institutional planning.

Chapter IV. Students and Student Services. This chapter provides a good example of how Northwest treated functional areas within its report: it introduces the importance of student services; describes the student demography; explains various services such as advisement, financial aid, housing, etc.; assesses the strengths, concerns, and evidence of effectiveness of student services; and lays out future plans.

Chapter XI. Summary Assessment. In this chapter Northwest summarizes its self-study by measuring itself against the Commission's Criteria for accreditation.

OHIO VALLEY COLLEGE

Parkersburg, West Virginia 26101

Ohio Valley College is a private, coeducational institution, accredited at the bachelor's degree-granting level, offering associate degree programs and a single bachelor's program in Bible. First accredited: 1977. Enrollment: 280.

The materials were selected from Ohio Valley College Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1982-83. Officials of the college have given their permission for these materials to be shared with representatives of other North Central Association institutions engaged in the self-study process. For information on the availability of individual copies of the self-study report, please contact the institution directly. The Self-Study, "Educating to Serve," is also available as ERIC document #224-514.

Ohio Valley College is a relatively new institution. It was granted candidacy in 1974 and received initial accreditation in 1977. This report resulted from an institutional self-study process carried out in preparation for the first comprehensive evaluation following initial accreditation. It documents the concrete actions taken by the institution after each Commission visit. It interweaves description and evaluation throughout. Periodic follow-up studies of graduates provide data for educational outcomes. The final section of the report gives evidence of thoughtful planning for the future. The report is organized around the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation.

The following excerpts from the Self-Study Report are available:

Table of Contents. This provides an extended outline of the report. It shows how the steering committee used the Criteria to cut across functional areas of the institution. Each chapter contains sections which are explicitly evaluative in nature.

Forward and Preface. These provide a succinct summary of the self-study process at a small institution and an abstract of the Self-Study Report.

Part IV. Evidence for Future Accomplishment of Purposes. Two chapters constitute the institution's evidence that it meets the fourth Evaluative Criterion. The first of the two chapters summarizes the evaluative component of the self-study process by listing the strengths and weaknesses of the institution. The institution proposes ways in which it plans to capitalize on the strengths and overcome the weaknesses. The second chapter takes both a broad and a focused perspective on the future. Starting with assumptions about the nation, the church, and the region, the chapter—through a series of projections and a campus master plan—charts the institution's future.

SELECTED SELF-STUDY MATERIALS

OTTAWA UNIVERSITY

Ottawa, Kansas 66067

Ottawa University is a private, not-for-profit institution affiliated with the American Baptist Church, accredited at the Bachelor's degree granting level. First accredited: 1914. Enrollment: 762(FTE).

The materials were selected from the Ottawa University Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1983-84. Officials of the university have given their permission for these materials to be shared with representatives of other North Central Association institutions engaged in the self-study process. For information on the availability of individual copies of the self-study report, please contact the institution directly.

The self-study report is a result of a comprehensive evaluation of the total institution, the conduct of which was guided by the study schedules provided by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. Of particular interest in this self-study is Chapter III, Achievement. It illustrates how a liberal arts institution may focus on measurement of purposes. In this study, the university is divided into two sections: the campus and the two external centers. This chapter restates the university's purposes and assesses how successfully criterion three is met at the campus and at the external centers.

The following excerpts from the Self-Study are available:

Table of Contents. This provides an extended outline of the report. It shows how the steering committee used the Criteria for Accreditation to organize the report.

Introduction. This provides a succinct summary of the self-study process at a liberal arts institution.

Chapter I. Mission and Purposes. The mission and purposes are indicated in response to the question, "Does Ottawa University have clear and publicly stated purposes, consistent with its mission and appropriate to a postsecondary educational institution?" This chapter is included to show the relationships and treatment of Criterion three and Criterion one for accreditation.

Chapter III. Achievement. This chapter constitutes the institution's evidence that it meets the third Criterion for accreditation. It shows how an institution, taking each of its purposes one-by-one from its mission statement, developed evidence to indicate it was achieving those purposes. To be noted is the explicit treatment of institutional purposes.

SELECTED SELF-STUDY MATERIALS

ROBERT MORRIS COLLEGE

Chicago, Illinois 60601

Robert Morris College is a private, not-for-profit institution offering diplomas and associate degree programs in Allied Health, Business Administration and Secretarial Science. Currently, Robert Morris College is a candidate for accreditation with the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Enrollment: 1642(FTE).

The materials were selected from Robert Morris College's Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for initial candidacy in 1983-84. Officials of the college have given their permission for these materials to be shared with representatives of other institutions who are engaged in the self-study process and are preparing for an upcoming evaluation visit by the North Central Association. For information on the availability of individual copies of the self-study report, please contact the institution directly.

The self-study report is a result of a comprehensive evaluation of the total institution, the conduct of which was guided by the study schedules provided by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. Of particular interest is Chapter IV, *Criterion Four*, which examines the relationship of the Criteria for Candidacy for Accreditation with the Criteria for Accreditation. In a second step it discusses how the college has the potential to achieve accreditation within the candidacy period by comparing and examining its current status against the actual Criteria for Accreditation.

The following excerpts from the Self-Study are available:

Table of Contents. This section provides an extended outline of the report. It shows how the steering committee used the Criteria for Candidacy for Accreditation to organize the report.

Chapter I. Introduction. This chapter contains information which demonstrates that the college meets the General Institutional Requirements and summarizes the self-study process.

Chapter II. Criterion One. The mission and purposes are indicated in response to the question, "Does Robert Morris College have clear and publicly stated purposes, consistent with its mission and appropriate to a postsecondary educational institution?" This chapter is included to show the relationship and treatment of Criterion three and Criterion one for Candidacy for Accreditation.

Chapter IV. Criterion Three. This chapter constitutes the institution's evidence that it meets the third Criterion for Candidacy for Accreditation. Outlined in this chapter are the institution's present and future plans for acquiring resources to accomplish all of its stated purposes.

Chapter V. Criterion Four. This chapter discusses the institution's potential to achieve accreditation within the candidacy period. It discusses the relationship between the candidacy criteria and the accreditation criteria. This allows one to visualize how the self-study for candidacy will be transformed into the self-study for accreditation.

SELECTED SELF-STUDY MATERIALS

SINTE GLESKA COLLEGE

Rosebud, South Dakota 57570

Sinte Gleska College, a tribal college chartered by the Rosebud Sioux, is accredited at the bachelor's level. It offers programs leading to the associate's degree and to bachelor's degrees in Human Services and Elementary Education at its primary site in Rosebud and at other locations on the reservation through a decentralized system of academic centers. First accredited: 1983. Enrollment: 350.

The materials were selected from Sinte Gleska College's Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for initial accreditation in 1982-83. Officials of the college have given their permission for these materials to be shared with representatives of other North Central Association institutions engaged in the self-study process. For information on the availability of individual copies of the self-study report, please contact the institution directly.

Sinte Gleska College, which moved from the associate's to the bachelor's degree-granting level during its candidacy period, submitted a self-study report for initial accreditation which documented its ability to provide an educational program which serves the unique needs of the Rosebud Sioux reservation.

The following excerpts from the Self-Study Report are available:

Table of Contents. This shows that the report includes the requisite introduction and summary, while the discrete chapters are related to the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation.

Mission and Purposes. This chapter describes the purposes behind and evolution of Sinte Gleska College's mission and shows that the college is achieving its mission of offering quality postsecondary education programs while preserving Lakota culture and facilitating individual and tribal autonomy.

Assessment. This chapter, an assessment of the effectiveness of the college's students, academic programs, and academic and student support services, demonstrates that the college is accomplishing its purposes, fulfilling Evaluative Criterion Three.

Potential for the Future. This chapter analyzes the processes and elements that will assure the college's ability to survive, maintain stability, and develop in the future, demonstrating that the college meets Evaluative Criterion Four.

Summary. This final chapter summarizes the college's strengths and concerns and shows that it meets the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation.

SOUTHERN OHIO COLLEGE

Cincinnati, Ohio 45237

Southern Ohio College is a private, for-profit coeducational institution accredited at the associate's degree granting level. Its offerings are focused primarily in the business, business-related and allied health fields. First accredited: 1982. Enrollment: 3100.

The materials were selected from the Southern Ohio College Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for initial accreditation. Officials of the college have given their permission for these materials to be shared with representatives of other North Central Association institutions engaged in the self-study process. For information on the availability of individual copies of the self-study report, please contact the institution directly.

Southern Ohio College was founded in 1927 as a traditional business school. Its modern history began in the early 1960's when it was accredited by the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools (AICS). In 1972, the State of Ohio granted the institution the authority to award the associate degree. In 1975, Metridata Education Systems, a privately held corporation, purchased the assets of Southern Ohio College. In 1984, the assets of the corporation were purchased by Josten's, Inc.

There are four core chapters of the self-study, each of which addresses one of the four Criteria for Accreditation. The first core chapter presents the mission and goals of the college in a psychological/philosophical framework. The second deals with effectiveness of organization and adequacy of resources. The third core chapter explores the outcome areas (the results, products). The final core chapter pushes into the probability of continuing to accomplish the institution's purposes in the future.

The following excerpts from the Self-Study report are available:

Table of Contents. This provides an extended outline of the report. It shows how the study coordinator and the steering committee used the Criteria to cut across functional areas of the institution. Each chapter contains material which is explicitly evaluative as well as descriptive.

The Preface and Introduction. These provide a succinct summary of the self-study process. They illustrate how the institution was willing to approach the task of preparing the self-study from a different point of view.

Chapter II. Mission and Goals. The mission and purposes are indicated in response to the question, "Does Southern Ohio College have clear and publicly stated purposes, consistent with its mission and appropriate to a postsecondary educational institution?" This chapter is included to show the relationships and treatment of Criterion three and Criterion one for accreditation.

Chapter IV. Outcome Areas. This chapter provides an extensive treatment of the accomplishment of the institution's purposes. Four areas were the center of focus: quality of student achievement, quality of administrative and educational services, quality of institutional life, and quality of contribution to outside communities. In studying these areas the institution followed a pattern of evaluation which may be characterized as defining, measuring, and confirming purposes, programs and services and accomplishment of purposes.

SELECTED SELF-STUDY MATERIALS

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-PARKSIDE

Kenosha, Wisconsin 53141

The University of Wisconsin-Parkside is a public, state-supported, coeducational institution, accredited at the master's degree-granting level, offering liberal arts, general, teacher preparatory, and professional programs. First accredited: 1972. Enrollment: 6,000.

The materials were selected from the University of Wisconsin-Parkside's Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1982-83. Officials of the college have given their permission for these materials to be shared with representatives of other North Central Association institutions engaged in the self-study process. For information on the availability of individual copies of the self-study report, please contact the institution directly.

The University of Wisconsin-Parkside, one of 13 degree-granting campuses in the University of Wisconsin System, is accredited at the master's degree-granting level. The campus opened in 1969. This self-study traces the development of the college from its beginning through a series of evaluation visits, providing in a single document a chronicle of a developing institution from its inception to its present level of effectiveness.

The following excerpts from the Self-Study Report are available:

Table of Contents. This shows that the report is organized around the essential elements required. Part I is an Introduction and Institutional Overview; Part II includes chapters which show that the University fulfills the General Institutional Requirements and the four Evaluative Criteria; and Part III provides summary evidence that the University meets the Criteria for Accreditation.

Introduction and Institutional Overview. This chapter provides an introduction to the University, indicates its present affiliation status, describes the self-study process and the structure of the report, and includes a brief history of the institution and its relationship to the Commission.

Mission and Priorities of UW-Parkside. This chapter describes and assesses the mission of the University of Wisconsin System, the University Cluster Core Mission, and the Select Mission of the UW-Parkside within the system. It provides insight into the role of a developing institution which is part of an extensive university system.

Planning at UW-Parkside. This chapter indicates the guiding principles of the planning process at a young, rapidly developing university and describes the institution's planning processes and structures in its various stages of development.

Outreach. This chapter assesses the effectiveness of a representative sample of the University's array of outreach efforts.

Summary and Conclusion. This final section provides summary evidence of the institution's effectiveness and shows that it meets the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation.

SAMPLE REQUEST FORM

SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL SELF-STUDY MATERIALS

Institutions for which selected self-study materials are available are listed below. Unless otherwise noted, the excerpts are from evaluations for continued accreditation.

Copies of these materials may be ordered by completing this request form and returning it to the Commission office.

_____ Developing the Self-Study Plan

_____ Arizona State University, AZ

_____ Arkansas Tech University, AR (Focused Evaluation)

_____ Delta College, MI

_____ Findlay College, OH

_____ Gustavus Adolphus College, MN

_____ Kearney State College, NE

_____ Manchester College, IN

_____ Mennonite College of Nursing, IL (Initial Candidacy)

_____ Northwest Community College, WY

_____ Ohio Valley College, WV

_____ Ottawa University, KS

_____ Robert Morris College, IN (Initial Candidacy)

_____ Sinte Gleska College, SD (Initial Accreditation)

_____ Southern Ohio College, OH (Initial Accreditation)

_____ University of Wisconsin-Parkside, WI

VI. Focused Evaluations

Focused evaluations do not require the kind of institutional self-study outlined in the rest of the *Guide;* nor do they require a comprehensive self-study report. Instead, an institution's preparation for a focused evaluation will vary in nature and scope according to the specific area to be examined; and its focused report will center on that area. In addition, the institution's materials for the evaluation will include any documents it believes the team should have before arriving on campus, relevant portions of the Basic Institutional Data Forms, and faculty and student handbooks.

Focused Reports

Focused evaluations are called for either to follow up on the progress an institution has made in addressing areas of previous concern or as part of the Commission's procedures for the approval of a proposed change in an institution's Statement of Affiliation Status. The report the institution prepares will differ slightly according to which of these occasions has prompted its evaluation, but in each case a focused report will have **three essential elements:**

- an introduction, *including the Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status*
- an examination of the area of focus and/or the requested change
- a summary assessment of the area of focus and/or the requested change

The **first essential element** of a focused report is the same as that of a comprehensive self-study (see pp. 18-20). In this introduction, the institution briefly cites the Commission action or policy that prompted the evaluation, discusses the process by which the report has been prepared, explains the organization of the report, and includes a completed Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status for the visit.

The **second essential element** of a focused report is the body of its evaluation of the area(s) to be examined. If the focused evaluation is being conducted to assess progress in responding to previous Commission concerns, this section of the report will detail that progress and explain the actions that have been taken since the last evaluation. It should evaluate that progress and indicate any further actions that may be planned. Depending on the area(s) of focus, this part of the report may be supplemented by audited financial statements, Board minutes, curriculum information, or other appendices which document the progress summarized in the report itself.

If the focused evaluation is being conducted under the Commission's *"Policy on Changes Affecting the Affiliation Status of an Institution,"* this section of the report should include five points:

- a description of the proposed change and the planning that led to it
- evidence that the institution has the necessary internal and external approvals to initiate the change
- evidence that the purposes of the change are clear and appropriate to the institution's purposes
- an analysis of the anticipated effect of the proposed change on the other parts of the institution
- evidence that the institution has organized adequate human, financial, and physical resources and processes to initiate, maintain and monitor the change and to assure acceptable quality

For further information on institutional change, see Chapter VII of *A Handbook of Accreditation.*

The **third essential element** of a focused report is a summary of the evidence that the institution has responded to the Commission's earlier concern(s) and/or that its request for a change in its Statement of Affiliation Status should be granted.

The focused report has no required length. Some will be quite brief; others will need to be rather lengthy. The guideline in preparing the report should be that it cover each of these essential elements adequately.

For further information on the focused evaluation, see Chapter V of *A Handbook of Accreditation* and Chapter VI of *A Manual for the Evaluation Visit.*

Resources For Self-Study

A primary resource for self-study and evaluation is the Commission itself. Commission materials pertinent to an institution's evaluation are usually sent to the institution two years before the on-site visit. Institutions scheduled for evaluation may also obtain sample self-study materials from the Commission office. And, in addition, Commission staff members have developed papers on the evaluation and accreditation process which are available on request. The *NCA Quarterly* 54 (Spring 1980), contains "Postsecondary Accreditation: A Current Bibliography," by H.R. Kells and Mary Patricia Robertson. Articles on self-study appear regularly in the *Quarterly*.

The following are some other resources on self-study and evaluation that may be of interest. Information on the availability of these documents can be obtained from the publishers or sponsoring organizations.

Philip Chamberlain's *Academic Institution—Building Model*, a self study process rooted in the strategic construct, specifies how to organize, analyze and interpret institutional data using nine interactive institutional and environmental variables. The model constructs an index for assessing effectiveness of the exchange of institutional outcomes for constituent provided resources and support (Department of Higher Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405).

Paul Dressel's *Handbook of Academic Evaluation* (Jossey-Bass, 1976) offers specific information on assessing institutional effectiveness, student progress, and professional performance for decision-making in higher education.

Effective Evaluation (Jossey-Bass, 1981) by Egon G. Guba and Yvonne S. Lincoln presents an approach combining responsive evaluation and naturalistic methodologies, and discusses how to limit and focus an inquiry and

ensure the validity, reliability and objectivity of its findings.

Improving Academic Management (Jossey-Bass, 1980), edited by Paul Jedamus and Marvin W. Peterson, includes sections on Academic Planning and Research, Assessing Performance, and Allocating Resources that treat measuring institutional effectiveness.

George Keller's *Academic Strategy, The Management Revolution in Higher Education* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983) describes the significant shifts of colleges and universities to a new style of management based on strategic planning and offers an agenda for the future of higher education.

H. R. Kells' *Self-Study Processes, A Guide for Postsecondary Institutions* (Macmillan, 1983) is designed as a handbook for self-study steering committee members and other participants in self-study and accreditation activities. Kells describes the context for and the concept of self-study and suggests general models for self-study. Specific information, checklists, and charts are provided for various phases of the self-study process and major sources of additional information are identified.

Richard I. Miller's *The Assessment of College Performance* (Jossey-Bass, 1979) provides practical assistance in institutional self-assessment in the form of evaluation strategies, models, case studies and specific evaluation aids such as tables, checklists, and rating forms. Miller identifies a number of measurable characteristics of postsecondary institutions that, together, determine an institution's overall quality or effectiveness.

Qualitative Data Analysis, A Sourcebook of New Methods (Sage Publications, 1984) by Matthew B. Miles and A. Michael Haberman, presents a conceptual framework and a variety of techniques for qualitative data analysis. This book is particularly helpful in understanding the contrasts and similarities between qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Its emphasis upon the analysis of data and techniques of conclusion drawing/verification substantively expands the usefulness and applicability of this approach to evaluation. The book is complemented by an article, "Drawing Valid Meaning from Qualitative Data: Toward a Shared Craft," in *Educational Researcher*, (May, 1984).

The College Student Experiences Questionnaire by C. Robert Pace provides a measure of quality of effort students put into using the facilities and opportunities provided for their learning and development in college. (Requires external scoring.) (Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA Graduate School of Education, 405 Hildgard Ave., Los Angeles CA 90024.)

Michael Quinn Patton's *Qualitative Evaluation Methods* (Sage, 1980) focuses on strategies for generating valid, useful and credible qualitative information which are useful in self-study. It also provides samples of different research strategies and evaluative instruments.

Understanding Accreditation (Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1983), by Kenneth E. Young, Charles M. Chambers, H.R. Kells. et al., is a comprehensive examination of how accreditation works, who participates in it, what impact it has on institutions and their various constituencies, and how it can be used to assess institutional achievements and plan improvements.

For those interested in the evaluation of nontraditional programs, a comprehensive annotated bibliography has been developed by a project of the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities of the State of Illinois and Community Service and Continuing Education, Title 1A of the Education Act of 1965, as amended. The bibliography is a separate second volume of the project report on *Evaluating Non-Traditional Programs: Strategies, Methods and Materials*, co-directed by Lawrence R. Murphy and Robert A. Pringle in 1979. An excellent summary of the COPA/Kellogg Project on the *Accreditation of Postsecondary Nontraditional Education* and other articles on the evaluation of nontraditional programs are available in the *NCA Quarterly* 53 (Winter 1979).

Educational Testing Service has a number of instruments for institutional self-study, evaluation, planning, and faculty evaluation which might serve as useful guidelines or as a source of ideas. They include the *Institutional Goals Inventory* (IGI), *Institutional Functioning Inventory* (IFI), *Community Colleges Goals Inventory* (CCGI), *Small College Goals Inventory* (SCGI), *Student Instructional Report* (SIR), and *Student Reactions to College* (SRC). (Educational Testing Service College and University Programs, Box 2813, Princeton, NJ 08540, 609/921-9000).

The American College Testing Program also has a number of instruments, including evaluation/survey instruments—*Student Opinion Survey, Withdrawing/Nonreturning Student Survey,* and *Alumni Survey*—offered through the ACT Evaluation/Survey Service. The *College Outcomes Measures Project* (COMP) measures general education and intellectual skills through an activity inventory, a measurement battery, and an objective test (The American College Testing Program, Institutional Services Area, P.O. Box 168, Iowa City, IA 52243, 319/337-1000).

The *Texas Student Information System* (TEX-SIS) is a comprehensive data-based student follow-up information system designed for community and junior colleges (Coordinator, Texas Student Information System, Navarro College, Highway 31 West, Corsicana, TX 75110, 214/874-6501).

A number of institutions have been involved in the programs of the National Center for Higher Education Management Service (NCHEMS) and are familiar with the outcome-oriented planning, management and evaluation framework developed by NCHEMS. NCHEMS has an extensive battery of data collection schemes and information system constructs as well as facilities, students, finances, course information, staff, and goal achievement measures (NCHEMS, P.O. Drawer P, Boulder, CO 80302, 303/447-1980).

A battery of management analysis and development instruments and training elements is available from HEMI, the Higher Education Management Institute. (Higher Education Management Institution, 2699 S. Bayshore Dr., Suite 1000A, Coconut Groge, FL 33133, 305/854-2318).

The *PERC Handbook,* published by the Empire State College Office of Research and Evaluation is intended to provide substantive data about Program Effectiveness and Related Costs for administrative and faculty decision-making. The PERC instruments can be adapted to the particular institution using them and are especially useful to new and alternative institutions (Educational Materials Distribution Center, Empire State College, P.O. Box 88, Saratoga Springs, NY 12866).

Institutions interested in developing expertise in the assessment of experiential learning will find materials

and assistance available from the Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning (CAEL), an educational association created to foster experiential learning and the valid and reliable assessment of outcomes (CAEL, 10598 Marble Faun Court, Columbia, MD 21044, 301/997-3535).

The Council on Graduate Schools (CGS) has developed some instruments and questionnaires to assist in the evaluation of graduate education programs (The Council on Graduate Schools, One DuPont Circle, Washington, D.C., 20036).

The Board's Role in Accreditation, published by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, is a useful introduction to the subject which recommends specific ways in which a Board's role in accreditation activities may be enhanced (One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, D. C. 20036).

NACUBO Writers on Financial Management includes sixty-three articles, many of which provide ways of evaluating effective financial management, compiled by the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO Order Desk, One DuPont Circle, Suite 510, Washington, D.C. 20036).

The *Chronicle of Higher Education* is also an excellent source of current information on publications and meetings relating to evaluation and assessment.

The Center for the Study of Evaluation at UCLA conducts inquiries into the nature of evaluation from a variety of perspectives. Its *Program Evaluation Kit* (1978) includes volumes on *How to Deal with Goals and Objectives* and *How to Measure Achievements* as well as an *Evaluators' Handbook* (Center for Study and Evaluation, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90032).

Three volumes sponsored by the Carnegie Commission, while not specifically directed toward methods of data gathering for self-study, provide provocative examples of the broad, institutional effects self-study in the face of change can engender. Harold L. Hodgkinson's *Institutions in Transition* (McGraw-Hill, 1971) includes case studies of response to change based on self-analysis at SUNY-Buffalo, Oberlin, Northern Illinois, Southern Colorado State College, and Chicago State. Dwight R. Ladd's

Change in Educational Policy (McGraw-Hill, 1970) examines self-study processes at eleven institutions including UCLA, Michigan State, Brown, Duke, Stanford and Columbia. *Academic Transformation* (McGraw-Hill, 1973), edited by David Reisman and Verne A. Stadtman, is a collection of essays on responses to change and self-study at Antioch, City College of New York, MIT, University of Michigan, Swarthmore, University of Wisconsin, et al.

Another Carnegie study, *Missions of the College Curriculum* (Jossey-Bass, 1977) considers influences that shape the curricula, and provides appendices on the goals of higher education and curriculum planning.

THE COMMISSION
1984-85

Dr. Bernard S. Adams (1986)
President, Ripon College, Ripon, WI 54971

Dr. James Ballowe (1985) (Vice-Chairperson)
Associate Provost and Dean of Graduate School, Bradley University, Peoria, IL 61625

Dr. Clair T. Blikre (1987)
President, North Dakota State School of Science, Wahpeton, ND 58075

Dr. John M.T. Chavis (1985)
Professor of History, Lincoln University of Missouri, 2223 Merlin Drive, Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dr. Frederick J. Crosson (1988)
O'Hara Distinguished Professor of Philosophy, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556

Ms. Sue Seibert Farnsworth, Esq. (1988) (public member)
1217 Chaplain Street, Wheeling, WV 26003

Mr. W. Howard Fort, Esq. (1985) (public member)
Schwab, Grosenbaugh, Fort and Seamon, Law and Commerce Building, 40 East Mill Street, Akron, OH 44308

Dr. Christine Gram (1985)
Academic Dean, Oakland Community College-Highland Lakes Campus, 7350 Cooley Lake Road, Union Lake, MI 48085

Dr. Reatha Clark King (1985)
President, Metropolitan State University, 121 Metro Square Bldg., St. Paul, MN 55101

Dr. William Mann (1987)
Chancellor, Metropolitan Community Colleges, 560 Westport Road, Kansas City, MO 64111

Sr. M. Janet McGilley (1987)
President, Saint Mary College, 4100 S. 4th Street Trafficway, Leavenworth, KS 66048

Dr. Ronald W. Roskens (1984) (Chairperson)
President, University of Nebraska, 3835 Holdrege, Lincoln, NE 68583

Dr. Lewis S. Salter (1987)
President, Wabash College, 301 W. Wabash, Crawfordsville, IN 47933

Mrs. Cordelia S. Spicer (1987) (public member)
Sun City West, AZ 85375

Dr. Alfred Sussman (1986)
Dean, Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48105